



Evaluation Readiness Assessment

Full report · Illustrative sample

Solicitation: Coastline County, Florida — RFP 25-0417-SW, Integrated Solid Waste Consulting Services

Proposer: Just For An Example, LLC (illustrative)

Submittal reviewed: Proposal dated March 12, 2025 — 4 pages, 6 sections

Award basis: Highest scoring proposer; weighted criteria scored 0–5 by evaluation committee

Review tier: Mid-Size · Standard turnaround

Executive Summary

EVALUATION READINESS SCORE

34 / 100

Not submittable in current form

This proposal is unlikely to be shortlisted, and the reasons are structural rather than stylistic. Six of the ten items enumerated in §7.1 through §7.4 are either absent or answered with a promise to supply them later. The committee scores each criterion on a whole-number scale from 0 to 5 under §8.1.4, weighted per OpenGov. Nothing scores above 0 when the exhibit is missing, and four required exhibits are missing outright: resumes, the graphical schedule, the organizational chart, and the second customer reference.

Two findings carry consequences beyond scoring. The subconsultant markup is set at 15% against a stated ceiling of 10% in §7.4 — a term the County cannot accept as written. And the hourly rates exclude travel and other direct expenses that §7.4 requires to be inside the rate, which makes the pricing appear more competitive than it is and converts a paper advantage into a credibility problem during negotiation.

One finding is more delicate. Section 2.1 volunteers that the Principal previously helped a Florida county draft scope language for a solid waste procurement, framed as insight into how these solicitations are evaluated. Paragraph 11.1 makes scope drafters ineligible to compete on the project whose scope they drafted. That is almost certainly not this project — but the sentence invites a committee to ask a question it would otherwise never have asked, and answers it in the least favourable phrasing available.

The underlying pattern is a proposal written to express enthusiasm rather than to be scored. The Letter of Interest runs past its one-page limit without naming a credential, a project, or a metric. The approach section describes a philosophy where §7.3.1 asks for staffing levels, technology, and equipment. None of this is a writing problem; it is a mismatch between what was submitted and what the committee has been instructed to score.

How to Read This Report

This report is written to be worked through, not just read. Everything below is tied to a specific paragraph of the solicitation so you can verify each point against the source documents yourself.

What the readiness score means

The score is a single figure from 0 to 100 estimating how close the submittal is to being competitive as written. It is not the County's score and the County will never see it. It combines three things: how many required items are present, how well the material that is present answers what was actually asked, and how much of the available scoring is being left uncollected. Below 50 means the submittal has structural gaps that no amount of editing will close. Between 50 and 75 means it is complete but under-competitive. Above 75 means it is competitive and the remaining work is refinement.

What the severity levels mean

Level	Meaning
CRITICAL	Would either make the submittal non-responsive, present a term the County cannot accept, or leave a scored item with nothing to score. Fix before submitting.
HIGH	Will not disqualify you, but costs real points on a scored criterion or creates a problem after award. Fix if time allows, and it should.
MEDIUM	Costs credibility or makes the evaluator work harder than necessary. Worth an hour.
LOW	Polish. Address only after everything above is done.

How each finding is structured

Every finding follows the same four parts, in the same order:

Part	What it tells you
What the RFP requires	The requirement in the solicitation's own words, with the paragraph number so you can confirm it.
What your proposal says	The specific text or omission in your submittal, with the page it appears on.
Why it matters	The consequence — what an evaluation committee does with it, and what it costs you.
Recommended fix	The specific change to make. Where a fix has a trap in it, the trap is named.

Each finding also carries a time-to-fix estimate on its heading strip. These assume the underlying facts exist and only need to be assembled and written — they do not include time to obtain a credential you do not hold or a reference you have not asked for.

A note on paragraph references

References written as §7.1.3 point to Part I of the RFP, the instructions to proposers. References written as Part II §IV point to the Scope of Services. References to Part III point to the insurance requirements. Where a finding turns on language in both, both are cited.

Severity summary

	Critical	High	Medium	Low	Total
--	----------	------	--------	-----	-------

Findings	6	6	4	1	17
----------	---	---	---	---	----

Critical findings are those that would either render the submittal non-responsive under §6.1, present a term the County cannot accept, or leave a scored criterion with no material to score.

Findings index

#	Finding	Severity	Time to fix	RFP reference
1	Resumes of key personnel omitted	CRITICAL	2–3 hours	§7.1.3
2	One customer listed; two required	CRITICAL	1 hour	§7.2.2
3	Customer list missing required fields	HIGH	30 minutes	§7.2.2
4	Schedule not provided graphically	CRITICAL	1–2 hours	§7.3.2
5	No organizational chart	CRITICAL	45 minutes	§7.3.3
6	Subconsultant markup exceeds 10% cap	CRITICAL	5 minutes	§7.4
7	Rates not fully burdened	CRITICAL	2 hours	§7.4
8	Position descriptions omitted	HIGH	45 minutes	§7.4
9	No SWANA certification named	HIGH	1 hour	§3.2.1
10	One qualifying project evidenced	HIGH	1–2 hours	§3.2.2
11	Scope-drafting disclosure	CRITICAL	15 minutes	§11.1
12	Professional liability below limit	HIGH	Broker call	Part III §D
13	Preference form not submitted	HIGH	20 minutes	§9.5, §8.1.3
14	Letter of Interest over length, no substance	MEDIUM	2 hours	§7.1.1
15	Approach omits staffing, technology, equipment	HIGH	4–6 hours	§7.3.1
16	Response intervals left vague	MEDIUM	20 minutes	Part II §IV
17	Structure does not follow RFP order	MEDIUM	1–2 hours	§7.0

START HERE. If you read nothing else, fix Findings 1, 2, 4 and 5 — the four missing exhibits. Together they take roughly five hours and they are the reason this submittal cannot be scored. Findings 6 and 7 take under three hours combined and remove the two contract terms the County cannot accept. Everything else improves a proposal that, until those six are done, will not be read closely enough to benefit.

Projected Scoring Exposure

The County's evaluation committee scores each criterion as a whole number from 0 to 5 under §8.1.4, where 5 is Excellent and 0 is N/A, then applies weights set in OpenGov. The table below estimates the score each criterion is likely to draw from the submittal as it stands, and what it could reach once the findings in this report are addressed. Weights are not reproduced here because they are published separately in OpenGov. The projection assumes an evaluator applying the scale conservatively to what was actually in front of them.

Criterion	As submitted	After fixes	What moves it
Qualifications — §7.1	1	4	Resumes and named SWANA credential
Experience — §7.2	2	4	Second customer; solid waste depth
Approach — §7.3	1	4	Chart, timeline graphic, resources
Compensation — §7.4	1	4	10% cap; burdened rates; descriptions
Preference points	0	Full	Submit the certification form

Paragraph 8.2.2 requires presentations from no fewer than the three highest scoring proposers where estimated costs exceed \$350,000 or where the top two scores fall within five points. A proposal scoring in this range does not reach that stage, which means there is no interview in which to repair the written record. Everything the committee will know about this firm is in the four pages reviewed here.

The ceiling column is deliberately capped at 4 rather than 5. Correcting these findings makes the proposal competitive; a 5 requires substantive differentiation the current draft does not attempt — a named methodology, a measurable outcome from prior work, or a specific insight into the County's integrated system described in Part II §II.

Detailed Findings

Ordered by consequence, not by where the item appears in your submittal. Each finding cites the location in your proposal and the governing RFP paragraph.

FINDING 1 **CRITICAL** TIME TO FIX: 2–3 hours

Resumes of key personnel omitted

Proposal: Section 1.3, page 2 RFP: Part I §7.1.3, §6.1

What the RFP requires. Resumes of key personnel, including subcontractors, demonstrating individual qualifications and experience. Paragraph 6.1 states that proposers who fail to upload required documents may be found non-responsive.

What your proposal says. “Our proposed project team is outlined below. Full resumes are available upon request.” Four bullet lines follow, three of which name no individual.

Why it matters. This is the single most damaging item in the submittal. Resumes are not supporting material here — they are an enumerated deliverable under §7.0, which states the information in each section will be used by the evaluation committee to evaluate and score. A committee cannot score a resume it does not have, and the scale in §8.1.4 bottoms out at 0 for N/A. Offering them “upon request” also invites the committee to conclude the team is not yet assembled, which §10.1 through §10.4 make consequential: key personnel changes after submission can only decrease scoring, never increase it.

Recommended fix. Include a one-page resume for every named individual, including subconsultant staff. If a role is genuinely unfilled, name the person you would assign and say so plainly rather than leaving it blank. Two identified people with real resumes outscore four placeholder lines every time.

FINDING 2 **CRITICAL** TIME TO FIX: 1 hour

Customer list contains one customer; two is the stated minimum

Proposal: Section 2.2, page 3 RFP: Part I §7.2.2

What the RFP requires. A list of customers provided similar services in the last five years, with contact information for a minimum of two and a maximum of ten.

What your proposal says. One customer: Harborview Municipal Utility District, followed by “Additional client references can be provided upon request.”

Why it matters. The count is short against an explicit minimum, and the closing sentence converts an oversight into a stated position. Paragraph 7.2.2 does contemplate confidentiality — it instructs proposers unable to give full private-sector detail to provide as much as possible. That is an accommodation for detail, not for count. Nothing in the RFP permits fewer than two customers.

Recommended fix. List between two and ten customers. Where a private client restricts disclosure, name the client generically, describe the work, and supply the dates, using §7.2.2’s own accommodation language so the committee sees you read it.

FINDING 3 **HIGH** TIME TO FIX: 30 minutes

Customer list missing required data fields

Proposal: Section 2.2 table, page 3 RFP: Part I §7.2.2

What the RFP requires. At a minimum: customer name, brief description of services, contract start and end dates, and the name, email, and telephone number of a contact person who can verify the information. Dollar value where possible.

What your proposal says. The table supplies name, a short description, “2022 – ongoing,” and a surname with a phone number. No email. No discrete start and end dates. No dollar value.

Why it matters. Each omission is small; together they cost you on a scored criterion for no reason. The missing email matters most in practice — committees verify references by email far more often than by phone, and a reference that cannot be reached quickly frequently ends up scored as unverified rather than chased.

Recommended fix. Rebuild the table with a column for every field §7.2.2 names. Use month and year for start and end. Add contract value wherever you are permitted to, since the RFP explicitly invites it and most competitors will omit it.

FINDING 4 **CRITICAL** TIME TO FIX: 1–2 hours

Schedule presented as prose; a graphical representation is required

Proposal: Section 3.2, page 3 RFP: Part I §7.3.2

What the RFP requires. A graphical representation of the proposed schedule and timeline indicating major milestones and deliverables.

What your proposal says. “Because the scope of services is task-order driven, a fixed project schedule is not applicable at the proposal stage.” A prose paragraph follows.

Why it matters. The requirement specifies a graphic and the proposal supplies an argument for not providing one. Evaluators score what is in front of them against the criterion in OpenGov, and a paragraph explaining why a required exhibit is absent reads as non-responsive rather than pragmatic. The reasoning is also wrong on its own terms: Part II §IV sets a defined intake sequence — respond within two business days, written project proposal within five business days of the initial consultation, task order, purchase order, then start — which is exactly a schedule and can be drawn.

Recommended fix. Produce a simple horizontal timeline of the Part II §IV task-order lifecycle with the two-day and five-day gates marked, plus a representative project track showing kickoff, data collection, draft, County review, and final. A single clean graphic satisfies the requirement and demonstrates you read Part II.

FINDING 5 **CRITICAL** TIME TO FIX: 45 minutes

No organizational chart provided

Proposal: Section 3.3, page 3 RFP: Part I §7.3.3

What the RFP requires. An organizational chart identifying all key personnel and their role in providing the requested services.

What your proposal says. A two-sentence narrative naming one individual and referring to “supporting staff” and subconsultants generally.

Why it matters. Like the schedule, this is a named exhibit rather than a topic. Narrative cannot substitute for a chart when the criterion asks for a chart. Combined with Finding 1, the proposal gives the committee no way to see who performs the work — the two omissions compound rather than add.

Recommended fix. Build a chart even if it is small. Principal-in-Charge at top, named leads for the technical disciplines you expect to be tasked in, subconsultant firms shown as attached boxes with their specialties. A three-box chart with real names beats no chart decisively.

FINDING 6 **CRITICAL** TIME TO FIX: 5 minutes

Subconsultant markup exceeds the stated ceiling

Proposal: Section 4 table, page 4 RFP: Part I §7.4

What the RFP requires. Subconsultants will be at cost plus a percent markup. Provide a percent markup; the markup shall not exceed 10% of the actual cost.

What your proposal says. “Subconsultants — Cost + 15% markup — Standard firm policy.”

Why it matters. The RFP sets a ceiling and the proposal exceeds it by half again, then justifies it as firm policy. This is not a scoring deduction so much as a term the County has no authority to accept as written. At best it triggers a clarification; at worst it reads as a proposer who either did not read §7.4 or read it and expected an exception. In a scored procurement with a cost criterion, either inference is expensive. Note also that Part II §III

lists nineteen service categories, several of which — waste composition studies, routing analysis, facility site assistance — are commonly subcontracted, so this rate is likely to apply frequently rather than rarely.

Recommended fix. Change to 10%. If your economics genuinely require more, raise your direct labor rates rather than breaching a stated cap, and say nothing about firm policy.

FINDING 7 CRITICAL TIME TO FIX: 2 hours

Hourly rates are not fully burdened; expenses billed separately

Proposal: Section 4 narrative, page 4 RFP: Part I §7.4

What the RFP requires. Hourly rates shall include all profit, direct and indirect labor costs, personnel related costs, overhead, administrative costs, travel related out-of-pocket expenses, and all other costs necessary to provide the services.

What your proposal says. “Travel, mileage, lodging, per diem, printing, and other direct expenses are billed separately at cost. Rates are subject to annual escalation.”

Why it matters. Every category listed in that sentence is one §7.4 requires inside the rate. Travel is named explicitly in the RFP text. The commercial consequence is the part most proposers miss: a committee comparing a \$225 principal rate that excludes travel against a competitor’s \$245 rate that includes it will read yours as cheaper on the page, then discover during negotiation that it is not. Where cost is scored, you gain a paper advantage you cannot keep and create a credibility problem at exactly the wrong moment. The escalation clause compounds it, since the RFP contemplates rates covering the contract term and does not invite annual increases.

Recommended fix. Reprice so every rate is genuinely all-in, modelled against realistic travel to County facilities and meeting attendance under Part II §III.V. Delete the separate-expenses sentence and the escalation sentence. State plainly that rates are fully burdened per §7.4.

FINDING 8 HIGH TIME TO FIX: 45 minutes

Position classifications and descriptions omitted

Proposal: Section 4 table, page 4 RFP: Part I §7.4

What the RFP requires. Include a position classification including a short description for each position being proposed.

What your proposal says. The rate table lists five position titles and a subconsultant line. No classifications, no descriptions.

Why it matters. Titles alone leave the committee unable to judge whether your Senior Analyst is the peer of another firm’s Project Manager. When rates are compared without definitions, evaluators default to comparing numbers, which favours whoever is cheapest rather than whoever is clearest.

Recommended fix. Add a short paragraph under each title stating the qualification, typical years of experience, and which of the Part II §III service categories that position would lead. Two sentences each is sufficient.

FINDING 9 HIGH TIME TO FIX: 1 hour

No SWANA certification identified

Proposal: Section 1.2, page 2 RFP: Part I §3.2.1

What the RFP requires. At least one of the proposer’s key personnel is SWANA certified in one or more of ten listed technical disciplines.

What your proposal says. “Our professional staff hold a variety of industry certifications and participate in continuing education throughout the year.” No certification is named.

Why it matters. This is a preferred rather than mandatory qualification, so it does not make the proposal non-responsive — but preferred qualifications exist to be scored, and this is a solid waste procurement where SWANA is the field’s recognised credential. Competing firms will name their certifications and the discipline held. The generic sentence used here scores no better than silence, and arguably worse, because it signals the proposer knew a certification question was being asked and chose not to answer it.

Recommended fix. If anyone on the team holds a SWANA credential, name the person, the credential, and which of the ten disciplines in §3.2.1 it falls under, matching the RFP’s own list order. If nobody does, name a subconsultant who does and show them on the org chart. If neither is possible, state the equivalent qualifications directly instead of gesturing at variety.

FINDING 10 HIGH TIME TO FIX: 1–2 hours

Only one qualifying project evidenced against a two-project preference

Proposal: Sections 2.1 and 2.2, pages 2–3 **RFP:** Part I §3.2.2

What the RFP requires. Proposer has provided similar consulting services on a minimum of two commercial, industrial, or government projects within the last five years.

What your proposal says. The narrative describes capabilities in general terms across several disciplines. Only Harborview is identified as a specific engagement.

Why it matters. The narrative claims breadth across solid waste, water resources, stormwater, permitting, and compliance, but §3.2.2 asks for similar services, and only one identified project is solid waste work. Breadth across unrelated disciplines does not answer a question about depth in this one, and an experienced committee reads a wide capability list with a single relevant example as evidence that solid waste is adjacent work rather than core practice.

Recommended fix. Identify at least two solid waste engagements from the last five years with enough specificity to be recognisable — what was studied, what was delivered, what changed as a result. Cut the unrelated discipline list to a single sentence.

FINDING 11 CRITICAL TIME TO FIX: 15 minutes

Prior scope-drafting disclosure creates an eligibility question

Proposal: Section 2.1, page 2 **RFP:** Part I §11.1

What the RFP requires. Any proposer who has drafted any portion of a scope of work or specifications for a project, or any entity providing material assistance in such work, shall be ineligible to compete for the contract for design or construction of that project.

What your proposal says. “Our Principal previously assisted a Florida county in developing scope language for a solid waste services procurement, which gives our firm valuable insight into how these solicitations are structured and evaluated.”

Why it matters. The sentence was written to signal insider familiarity and instead raises the one question no proposer wants a committee asking. Read literally, §11.1 is directed at the project whose scope was drafted, and prior work for a different county is unlikely to bar this pursuit. But the committee reading it does not have your file, and the phrasing invites them to wonder whether the assistance touched this procurement. The closing clause — insight into how solicitations are evaluated — makes it worse by implying an advantage in the evaluation itself, which is precisely the appearance §11.1 exists to prevent.

Recommended fix. Rewrite so the value is the expertise, not the access: describe experience advising public agencies on solid waste procurement, without characterising it as insight into how proposals are scored. If any of that work touched this County or this scope, disclose it explicitly and affirmatively address §11.1 rather than leaving the committee to infer.

FINDING 12 HIGH TIME TO FIX: Broker call

Professional liability limit below the stated requirement

Proposal: Section 5, page 4 **RFP:** Part III §D

What the RFP requires. Professional Liability or equivalent Errors & Omissions insurance with limits not less than \$1,000,000 per claim and in the aggregate. If claims-made, the retroactive date must precede the contract effective date, and certificates must be provided for two years after final payment or evidence of a two-year extended reporting period endorsement.

What your proposal says. “Professional Liability / Errors & Omissions — \$500,000 per claim.” No aggregate stated, no claims-made terms addressed.

Why it matters. The limit is half what is required, and for a consulting contract professional liability is the coverage that actually matters — the exposure here is bad advice, not bodily injury. Three separate gaps sit in one line: the limit, the missing aggregate, and silence on the claims-made conditions in §D.a and §D.b. The tail requirement in particular is a real cost that a proposer who has not priced it will discover after award.

Recommended fix. Confirm with your broker whether the policy can be raised to \$1M per claim and aggregate, and what the two-year tail costs. Then state the limit, the aggregate, the retroactive date position, and the tail commitment explicitly. Also add the Business Auto figure against the \$500,000 requirement and confirm the County will be endorsed as additional insured on the CGL per Part III §B — the proposal lists CGL limits correctly but never mentions the endorsement.

FINDING 13 **HIGH** TIME TO FIX: 20 minutes

Local and American Business Certification Form not submitted

Proposal: Not present RFP: Part I §9.5, §8.1.3

What the RFP requires. Proposers wishing to be considered for Local Business Preference or American Business Preference must complete and submit the Local & American Business Certification Form. Paragraph 8.1.3 states only proposers who submit required documentation are eligible to receive preference points. The preference box is checked as applying to this award.

What your proposal says. No reference anywhere in the submittal.

Why it matters. This is free score left on the table. The preference is active for this solicitation and the form is the only way to claim it. A Tampa-based firm may or may not qualify as local under the County’s definition, but the American Business Preference is separately available and the form is short.

Recommended fix. Locate the form in the Vendor Questionnaire section, complete both preference sections, and submit it with the response. Check the County’s local definition before assuming you fall outside it.

FINDING 14 **MEDIUM** TIME TO FIX: 2 hours

Letter of Interest exceeds the one-page limit and carries no qualifications

Proposal: Pages 1–2 RFP: Part I §7.1.1

What the RFP requires. A single page Letter of Interest summarising the proposer’s qualifications.

What your proposal says. The letter runs beyond a single page and contains no qualifications — it describes philosophy, collaboration, and enthusiasm across four paragraphs.

Why it matters. Two problems in one exhibit. The length breaches a stated limit, which evaluators notice on the first page of the submittal and which colours everything after it. More costly is the content: §7.1.1 asks the letter to summarise qualifications, and this one names no credential, no project, no metric, and no person other than the signatory. The phrases doing the work — uniquely positioned, client-first philosophy, trusted extension of your staff — appear in most losing proposals and are unscorable by design.

Recommended fix. Rewrite to one page and make every paragraph carry a fact. Years in solid waste specifically, the two qualifying projects from §3.2.2, the SWANA credential and discipline, the named team, and one sentence on why the County’s integrated system suits your practice. Delete every sentence that would remain true if the firm name were swapped for a competitor’s.

FINDING 15 **HIGH** TIME TO FIX: 4–6 hours

Approach omits staffing levels, technology, and equipment

Proposal: Section 3.1, page 3 RFP: Part I §7.3.1

What the RFP requires. A detailed project approach including the proposed strategy for providing the requested services. Anticipated resources, including but not limited to staffing levels, technology, and equipment, should be provided.

What your proposal says. Three paragraphs describing a listening-first philosophy, industry-standard methodologies, and embedded quality control. None of the three named resource categories appears.

Why it matters. The RFP names three specific resource categories and the proposal addresses none. “Industry-standard methodologies” is the tell — an evaluator scoring this criterion is looking for which methodology, applied to which of the nineteen service categories in Part II §III, using what. Waste composition studies in particular have recognised sampling protocols, and naming the one you follow is the difference between a 2 and a 4 on a five-point scale.

Recommended fix. Restructure around the actual scope. Group the Part II §III services into three or four families, and for each state the method, the staffing, and the tools. Name your sampling protocol, your routing or modelling software, your survey platform, and your field equipment.

FINDING 16 MEDIUM TIME TO FIX: 20 minutes

Response commitments vague where the RFP sets firm intervals

Proposal: Section 3.2, page 3 RFP: Part II §IV.A, §IV.B

What the RFP requires. Consultant shall respond verbally or via email to the County’s request within two business days, and shall provide a written project proposal within five business days of the initial consultation unless additional time is approved.

What your proposal says. “We would expect to acknowledge a County request promptly, meet with staff shortly thereafter, and deliver a written project proposal within a reasonable timeframe.”

Why it matters. The RFP states two intervals in business days and the proposal answers with promptly, shortly, and reasonable. Committees read this as either not having found §IV or not being willing to commit to it. Restating a contractual interval you are already bound by costs nothing and reads as competence.

Recommended fix. Replace with the intervals verbatim, then add what you do inside them: acknowledge within two business days, consultation within a stated window, written project proposal within five business days containing the scope, timeline, hours, rates, staffing, materials, equipment, permits, and estimated start date that §IV.B.1 and §IV.B.2 enumerate.

FINDING 17 MEDIUM TIME TO FIX: 1–2 hours

Structure does not follow the RFP’s section order

Proposal: Throughout RFP: Part I §7.0

What the RFP requires. The information requested in each section will be used by the evaluation committee to evaluate and score written proposals, submitted in the format requested.

What your proposal says. The proposal uses its own numbering — Sections 1 through 6 — which only partly tracks §7.1 through §7.4, and folds insurance and a closing into the same sequence.

Why it matters. Evaluators score criterion by criterion, usually with the RFP open beside the submittal. Every minute spent hunting for where you answered §7.3.2 is a minute not spent being persuaded, and anything not found quickly tends to be scored as absent. This finding costs little on its own and multiplies the cost of every finding above it.

Recommended fix. Mirror the RFP numbering exactly. Head each section with the RFP paragraph number and title, in order, so a committee can score straight down the page. Where the RFP asks for something you have placed elsewhere, cross-reference it by page.

Prioritized Recommendations

Sequenced by dependency and effort. Items 1 through 4 are the ones that must be completed for the submittal to be scoreable at all.

1. Assemble and insert resumes for every named individual, including subconsultant staff. Nothing else in Section §7.1 can be scored until this exists. (Finding 1)
2. Add a second and ideally a third customer to the §7.2.2 table, with every required field populated — name, description, discrete start and end dates, contact name, email, and telephone. (Findings 2, 3)
3. Correct the two compensation terms: markup to 10%, and rebuild the rate table so every rate is fully burdened including travel. Delete the separate-expenses and annual escalation sentences. (Findings 6, 7)
4. Produce the two missing exhibits — a timeline graphic built on the Part II §IV intake sequence, and an organizational chart with real names. (Findings 4, 5)
5. Rewrite the Section 2.1 sentence about prior scope drafting so it describes expertise rather than evaluation insight, and address §11.1 directly if any prior work touched this County. (Finding 11)
6. Name the SWANA credential and discipline, or the subconsultant who holds one, and identify a second solid waste engagement within five years. (Findings 9, 10)
7. Confirm professional liability at \$1M per claim and aggregate, resolve the claims-made tail, state the additional insured endorsement, and add the Business Auto limit. (Finding 12)
8. Complete and submit the Local & American Business Certification Form. (Finding 13)
9. Rewrite the Letter of Interest to one page carrying facts, add position descriptions, restate the Part II §IV intervals verbatim, and renumber the whole document to mirror §7.1 through §7.4. (Findings 8, 14, 16, 17)
10. Rebuild the approach section around the Part II §III service categories, naming methodology, staffing, and equipment for each family of work. (Finding 15)

What we did not find

For completeness: the joint venture provision at §2.2 does not apply, no timeliness issue is apparent, the CGL limits stated meet Part III §B, and nothing in the submittal appears to misrepresent the firm's capabilities. The problems in this proposal are of omission rather than overstatement, which is the more repairable of the two.

Glossary

Terms used in this report that carry a specific meaning in public procurement.

Term	Meaning
Non-responsive	A submittal that fails a stated requirement and is set aside without being scored. It is a procedural outcome, not a judgement about the firm.
Responsive and responsible	Responsive means the submittal complied with the instructions. Responsible means the firm is judged capable of performing. Both are required before an award.
Evaluation committee	The panel of County staff who read and score proposals against published criteria. They generally score independently, then compare.
Shortlist	The subset of highest-scoring proposers invited to present or interview. Under §8.2.2 this is normally the top three.
Fully burdened rate	An hourly rate that already contains everything — wages, overhead, profit, travel, admin. Nothing is added to the invoice afterward.
Task order	An individual work assignment issued under a standing contract, with its own scope, schedule, and cost estimate. Part II §IV sets how they are issued here.
Subconsultant markup	The percentage a prime adds to a subconsultant's cost. Capped at 10% by §7.4.
Preference points	Additional scoring credit for qualifying local or American businesses. Claimable only by submitting the certification form.
SWANA	Solid Waste Association of North America. Its technical certifications are the recognised credential in this field; §3.2.1 lists ten disciplines.
Claims-made policy	Insurance covering claims reported while the policy is active, rather than incidents that occurred while it was active. Timing matters more than with other coverage.
Retroactive date	On a claims-made policy, the earliest date of work the policy will cover. Part III §D requires it to precede the contract start.
Extended reporting period (tail)	An add-on allowing claims to be reported after a claims-made policy ends. Part III §D requires two years past final payment.
Additional insured	An endorsement extending your liability policy to cover the County as well. Required by Part III §B and easy to overlook.



AKROS STRATEGY

Akros Partners LLC d/b/a Akros Strategy · akrosstrategy.com

Illustrative sample. Just For An Example, LLC and Coastline County are fictional; the proposal reviewed was created for demonstration and was never submitted to any agency. Akros Strategy provides advisory review based

on publicly available procurement practice. We do not write proposals, do not submit them, and do not guarantee awards.